Attorney's Docket No.: 10559-424001 / P10438

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the above-referenced application are respectfully requested.

Claim amendments are presented herein to obviate the current rejection. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1-3, 5-11, 12-16, 23-24, 26-27, and 32-36 stand rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Jones in view of Cruickshank. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite automatically determining whether at least one additional interface should be opened based on a usage parameter, and if so, automatically opening the at least one additional interface and adding the at least one additional interface to the list, and periodically ranking the interfaces on the list of interfaces from most preferable to least preferable (for support, see, inter alia, specification par. 33, previous claims 32, 33, and 36). Claims 9 and 23 were similarly amended.

In the office action, previous claims 32-36 were rejected based on the allegation that Cruickshank discloses an Internet interface and is effectively removed from a set of available interfaces when the QoS drops below a certain threshold and effectively added when the QoS is back above the threshold.

PAGE 13/15 * RCVD AT 12/2/2005 1:38:42 PM [Eastern Standard Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-6/26 * DNIS:2738300 * CSID:1 858 678 5099 * DURATION (mm-ss):04-36

However, it is respectfully submitted that Cruickshank relates to an arrangement in which switching between currently available interfaces is based on QoS (see, inter alia, Cruickshank col. 2, lines 62-67) as opposed to opening new interfaces. With claim 1, once an interface is opened, operating only occurs with such an interface if it is ranked as most preferable in the list. Cruickshank simply discloses a mechanism by which previously "opened" interfaces are use when QoS falls below a predetermined level.

Moreover, with Cruickshank, the addition of a new PBX as part of a corporate network is accomplished by a user manually entering in an IP address of a pre-existing PBX (see, inter alia, col. 3, lines 18-26). This configuration is different than automatically opening an interface based on a usage parameter as the PBX is manually added to the network. Moreover, there is no suggestion within Cruickshank why the additional PBX is added and in particular, there is no suggestion that the PBX is added based on a usage parameter.

Accordingly, claims 1, 9, 23 and their dependent claims should be allowable.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed in this paper. However, failure to address a specific rejection, issue or comment, does not signify agreement with or

PAGE 14/15 * RCVD AT 12/2/2005 1:38:42 PM [Eastern Standard Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-6/26 * DNIS:2738300 * CSID:1 858 678 5099 * DURATION (mm-ss):04-36

concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above are not intended to be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Applicant asks that all claims be allowed. Please apply any charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 12/2/05

Scott C. Harris
Reg. No. 32,030
Attorney for Intel Corporation

Fish & Richardson P.C.
PTO Customer Number: 20985
12390 El Camino Real
San Diego, California 92130
Telephone: (858) 678-5070
Facsimile: (858) 678-5099

10562295.doc

CARL A. KUKKONEN, III
REG. NO. 42,773

PAGE 15/15 * RCVD AT 12/2/2005 1:38:42 PM [Eastern Standard Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-6/26 * DNIS:2738300 * CSID:1 858 678 5099 * DURATION (mm-ss):04-36